

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Title of the thesis: | The Securitization of Migration in the European Union during 2015. An analysis of the discourse in Germany, Hungary and the Czech Republic |
| Author of the thesis: | Laura Martinez |
| Referee (incl. titles): | Mgr. Martin Riegl, Ph.D. |

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

| CATEGORY | POINTS |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i> | 17 |
| <i>Contribution (max. 20)</i> | 18 |
| <i>Methods (max. 20)</i> | 17 |
| <i>Literature (max. 20)</i> | 18 |
| <i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i> | 17 |
| TOTAL POINTS (max. 100) | 87 |
| The proposed grade (1-2-3-4) | 1 |

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background: Author's research is based on theory of securitization (Copenhagen school) of migration and political territoriality. "Accordingly, the following research questions try to achieve this goal: - How migration is constructed into a security issue? - How securitization of migration in the European Union has evolved during 2015? - How the European Union has responded to the refugee crisis in 2015? - How the development of a common migration policy is implicated in the securitization of migration? To this end, this research establishes the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses: - Hypothesis: During 2015, the discourse over migration in Europe has evolved from a humanitarian perspective to a securitization approach. - Sub-hypothesis 1: The creation of a common European migration policy and the strengthening of the border security management and surveillance is the expression of the securitization of migration. - Sub-hypothesis 2: The securitization of migration in Europe is driven through the discursive representation of the migrant as a threat for the cultural identity and the welfare of the Member States."

The analyzed topics is profoundly framed withing the theoretical framework and is a strong part of the thesis.

2) Contribution: The objective of this thesis is to analyze and evaluate a shift in the approach of particular European countries towards migration during the year 2015. Author's research is aiming for explanation of the shift from a humanitarian perspective to a security approach.

The author presents comprehensive and to some extent original research which provides highly topical (migration is ranking top at the EU as well as national political agenda) and transformative synthesis which makes this thesis contributive to present-day debate. She offers a deep insight into origins of securitization of migration which is anything but new in the European discourse.

To sum up my review L.Martinez presents an analyses of how latest migration crisis is perceived in above mentioned EU members states (Germany, Hungary and the Czech Republic), frames it within the concept of securitization of migration or political territoriality. The author argues

3) Methods: Methodology (discourse analysis focused on key decision makers – namely German PM Merkel, Hungarian PM Orban and Czech president Zeman) is clearly stated as well as the hypotheses and research questions. The author has conceptualized terms which are quite often confused in the current debate like migrant, asylum seekers, refugee, irregular migrant, illegal /irregular entry or irregular entry/stay as defined by the European institutions, OECD or the Geneva convention. To analyze the securitization of migration, Mrs. Martinez has decided to narrow her research on three case study – Germany (as a target country), Hungary (as a transit country heavily hit by the migration flow during the year 2015) and the Czech Republic which has not received a significant number of asylum applications nor was not a primary transit country in the year 2015.

4) Literature: The author quotes very extensive, relevant and recent literature which shows that the author has a profound knowledge of the literature, stats, data, documents (drafted by EU institutions and other international organizations), internet resources concerning the topic. The author further analyzes relevant documents, public speeches etc.

From the formal point of view, some internet resources, respectively links seem to be non-existing (see: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/backgroundinformation/docs/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf) or references are missing (f.e. http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics, Buzan 2000, Buonfino).

5) Manuscript form: The thesis is clear and well structured (including introduction and conclusion), the author uses appropriate language and the thesis has proper academic format. I am sympathetic to analysis of the current migration crisis, therefore I can recommend this paper for a defence. I recommend A grade (excellent). Furthermore, crucial theoretical works (Waever, Buzan and many others) are covered in the thesis.

DATE OF EVALUATION: 10.6. 2016

Referee Signature

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

3) METHODS: Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic **format** for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

| TOTAL POINTS | GRADE | Czech grading | US grading |
|--------------|----------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| 81 – 100 | 1 | = excellent | = A |
| 61 – 80 | 2 | = good | = B |
| 51 – 60 | 3 | = satisfactory | = C |
| 41 – 50 | 3 | = satisfactory | = D |
| 0 – 40 | 4 | = fail | = not recommended for defence |